

**HANFORD SITE TECHNOLOGY COORDINATION GROUP
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING**

ETB Columbia River Room
Tuesday, August 13, 1996
8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

I. WELCOME/INTRODUCTION

Chris Bader welcomed the group and asked for introductions around the room. Tom Anderson, head of technology management for Fluor Daniel Hanford Inc., was in attendance for the first time. He provided the group with a short autobiographical sketch, including the facts that he worked for the Rand Corporation in Washington, D.C. on science and technology policy and was previously employed by PNNL. He is in the ETC-2 Building and can be reached at 372-8252.

Debbie Trader summarized the Weapons Complex Monitor Conference on the future of Hanford that was held in Richland on August 6-8. On August 8, a workshop was held to highlight the Hanford Technology Deployment Center. The workshop participants gave positive feedback on the concept. Debbie also mentioned the Spectrum '96 Conference in Seattle on August 18-22. On August 20, the conference will highlight the national EM technology focus areas.

Jeff Frey stated that both of the D&D large-scale demonstration proposals were submitted to METC. The open issues regarding the management structure of the Integrating Contractor Team for the 324/325 hot cell and glovebox proposal were resolved. Contract awards will be announced on October 1.

Jeff also noted that Hanford has not received any formal response to its non-thermal treatment proposal submitted to the Mixed Waste Focus Area. However, we heard informally that Rocky Flats had won. Nonetheless, Gary Huffman of DOE/Rocky Flats wants Hanford to be a partner in their demonstration project.

Shannon Saget stated the meeting purpose:

- to understand the Hanford 10-Year Plan and discuss how technology should be incorporated,
- to learn how the Tanks Focus Area (TFA) is meeting Hanford's tank technology needs, and
- to vote on the STCG Communications Plan.

II. MEETING OUTCOMES

Shannon reviewed the meeting outcomes:

- A list of questions is developed (to be addressed at the next meeting) on technology's role in the Hanford 10-Year Plan.
- The STCG has a good understanding of how TFA is meeting Hanford's needs.

- The STCG Communications Plan finalized.

The agenda was reviewed and modified slightly.

III. MEETING DECISIONS

- Does the Management Council endorse the STCG Communications Plan?

IV. NATIONAL STCG MEETING

Nancy Uziemblo presented an overview of the STCG Complex-Wide Workshop held in June 1996. She and Shannon Saget were the Hanford STCG representatives. The objective of the workshop was for all of the chartered STCGs to provide updates on products, successes, areas of concern, and lessons learned. Sixty issues were mentioned in the following areas: budget/schedules, needs/priority setting, communications, and policy/procedure consistency. The representatives voted as a group to concentrate on needs and priority setting. They recognized that each site is addressing its technology needs differently, thus they decided to develop a uniform approach to definitions, needs, and priority setting for the next iteration of the needs assessment process.

The group agreed to give the sites flexibility on priority setting as long as each STCG: 1) has a defensible process for ranking site problems and needs, 2) sets priorities by program as a minimum, and 3) ties the process to ADSs, RDSs, and the 10-Year Plan. The minimum set of prioritization criteria includes:

- technology gaps
- urgency
- cost reduction
- effectiveness improvement
- risk reduction
- safety and schedule improvements.

The group also agreed on a standardized format for the needs lists submitted to the Focus Areas. All lists must include functional performance requirements for the technology needs and current baseline technology information. Sites must also agree on a schedule to support Focus Area requests for both technology needs lists and proposals.

Communications among the STCGs were considered to be very important. Collaboration among STCGs will result in increased leveraging of funds and consistent products and actions. Site representatives will be asked to attend future Technology Development Council Meetings with EM-50 HQ and the Focus Area sites. Two STCG representatives will be asked to attend each meeting, one from a small site and one from a large site. This responsibility will be rotated around the field.

Rick Gonzalez asked who funds the site representatives to attend these national meetings. Shannon responded that EM-50 has funded them so far, and Debbie Trader said that funding responsibility would be decided on a case-by-case basis in the future. At some point, one of these meetings will likely be hosted here at Hanford. Nancy's key message was that the STCG technology needs drive the entire EM system now. They are the reason the Focus Areas exist. The Focus Areas realize that the STCGs are their customers.

Chris Bader asked how technology proposals are prioritized by the Focus Areas. Shannon responded that DOE/HQ Process Improvement Teams are trying to develop a national prioritization process and criteria for the Focus Areas to use.

V. HOW TECHNOLOGY FITS IN THE HANFORD 10-YEAR PLAN

Jim Daily's presentation addressed the following questions:

- What is the Hanford 10-Year Plan?
- Why do we have it?
- What's in it?
- What is the public involvement process?
- How does technology fit into it?

Al Alm's vision is to complete cleanup at most sites in the DOE Complex (but not Hanford or Savannah River) within 10 years. In return for this acceleration of the cleanup effort, he asked Congress for level funding for 10 years. The intent of the 10-Year Plan is to: 1) eliminate the most urgent risks, 2) reduce mortgages, and 3) collaborate with stakeholders. One of the seven guiding principles for the 10-Year Plan is to focus technology development on cost and risk reduction.

Jim stated that the 10-Year Plan has been a quick-turnaround process for the Site. DOE must have a 10-Year Plan by September 25. The first Hanford draft was issued on July 31, and it indicates a lack of focus on technology needs. Most programs said technology needs were "to be determined". The Hanford Advisory Board is developing their own 10-year vision to present to Alm when he visits Hanford on September 6 to meet with the Hanford stakeholders and the Tribes.

Alm is not happy with the cleanup costs beyond 10 years. Hanford's life-cycle cleanup cost is about \$45 billion (according to the adjusted 1996 BEMR), with only \$15 billion being spend in the first 10 years. That leaves a \$30 billion out-year cost for Hanford cleanup. In comparison, the total life-cycle cleanup cost for Savannah River is \$20 billion.

The Hanford Site Management Board guidance was to accelerate environmental restoration, TWRS, and waste management activities with the funds freed up by mortgage reduction in spent fuels and facility transition. They do not want to commit to a fuzzy baseline with no technical basis, so they want the Hanford 10-Year Plan to be based on the Hanford Endstate Plan, which is based on the Hanford Strategic Plan. The Hanford 10-Year Plan contains 29 "projects".

The Multi-Year Work Plans that were due on August 15 are not connected to the 10-Year Plan or budget at this point. The 10-Year Plan will likely be used as the Baseline Plan in the future, and ADSs and RDSs will probably disappear.

There is a disconnect between the STCG technology needs and the 10-Year Plan. The program POCs stated that there are no technology needs preventing achievement of the 10-Year Plan. These POCs should look at their plans and identify areas of potential cost and risk reduction to drive technology development.

Questions for Next Management Council Meeting

The following Management Council members volunteered for an STCG Ad-Hoc Committee to address questions related to the 10-Year Plan: Donna Wanek, Bob Cook, Dib Goswami, Tom Engel, Cathy Louie, Joe Waring, Jerry White, and Tom Page. This committee should meet with the program points-of-contact (POCs) for the 10-Year Plan prior to the next Management Council meeting and address the questions listed below. In addition, an STCG representative should attend Jim Daily's weekly meeting with the program POCs to discuss the STCG's concerns.

The questions that need to be answered by the committee before the next meeting include:

- What is the critical path for each program?
- What are their 5-10 most difficult tasks?
- Do we have all the technology needs from each of the programs?
- Can we identify "breakthrough ideas" to reduce cost and risk?
- Should technology be focused on achieving the 10-Year Plan or on investing to reduce the life-cycle cost of Hanford cleanup?

Parking Lot Issues for Jim Daily

- The program baselines are not accepted by some stakeholders.
- The assumed endstates are not accepted by some stakeholders.
- The STCG Management Council strongly disagrees with the statement that no technology is needed to achieve the 10-Year Plan.
- The Plan should focus on quality rather than cost and schedule (i.e., reduce the time period where institutional controls are required).
- Cleanup of the Columbia River should be completed within 10 years.
- Make sure the technology development projects that are supported by the STCG and are already funded are included in the 10-Year Plan (i.e., the Hanford Tanks Initiative, C-Reactor Interim Safe Storage).
- The 10-Year Plan must challenge the DOE system, not just maintain the status quo.

VI. DEPLOYMENT CENTER ACTIVITIES

Debbie Trader showed a brief video about the Deployment Center and then presented a status of the Program Plan and the protocols. A project with FY96 funds available is being sought to serve as a prototype for the Deployment Center.

VII. TANKS FOCUS AREA FY97/FY98 PLANS AND PRIORITIES

Tom Brouns presented an overview of the Tank Focus Area's (TFA's) recent program development activities. TFA developed the FY97 PEG in response to the tank technology needs developed by the STCG Tank Subgroup and other STCGs. It is a difficult job in these times of drastically declining EM-30 and EM-40 tank technology budgets, with TFA funding not increasing enough to fill the gap. The EM-30/EM-40 budgets have decreased from \$60-80M in FY95 to about \$17M in FY97. TFA's budget was \$26.5M in FY95, \$28.5M in FY96, and is expected to be \$37.1M in FY97.

TFA is faced with high expectations from the sites, but not enough funds to deal with the Complex-wide risks. Under these circumstances, integration and collaboration are essential. TFA is addressing high-impact areas as much as possible, and the EM-50 cross-cutting programs are helping by looking at areas of long-range impact. TFA would like to set aside part of their budget (about 10%) for high-risk, high-payoff initiatives. Currently, most of their funding is focused on baseline problems rather than new, innovative technologies.

TFA's FY97 program is highly (60%) mortgaged. These mortgages will decrease significantly in FY98 (mainly the LDUA work), and then TFA will be able to provide better support to TWRS. Many of Hanford's needs will be addressed then. The most significant TFA activity at Hanford in FY97 is the Hanford Tanks Initiative (HTI).

The TFA Program is based on high-impact needs from the national perspective based on:

- site priority
- cost reduction potential
- confidence in what the technology will do
- broad-based benefit

TFA's "high-impact" technologies include early-deployment, broad-impact technologies, as well as high-risk, high-impact technologies.

The rationale for certain needs not being addressed by TFA includes:

- Schedule requirements are incompatible with technology development.
- Baseline or recently developed methods are available.
- Current technology (related or enabling) requires completion and deployment commitment.
- Ongoing activities could address need (e.g., prescriptive need).
- Scope conflicts with privatization scope or requires privatization details prior to initiation.
- Other programs are performing this and/or related work scope (avoiding duplication).

Tom distributed copies of his vugraphs and a table showing the status of TFA's response to all 61 of the tank technology needs submitted by the STCG Tank Subgroup.

His key message was that the majority of the TFA FY97 budget does support Hanford's needs and does benefit this Site.

VIII. STCG COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

Dave Dillman gave a very brief overview of the STCG Communications Plan and stated that there is still an opportunity to "tweak" it if anyone has any suggested modifications. Then the Management Council addressed the following decision: Does the Management Council endorse the STCG Communications Plan? They voted yes. An ad-hoc committee was formed to address the three action items identified by Dave Dillman:

1. Assess available and needed marketing tools. Costs and schedules must be presented to the Management Council.
2. Develop planned schedule of communicating program to external/internal audiences. Who leads?
3. Determine performance measures to insure direction and success.

This committee will be chaired by Dave and will include Jerry White, Dennis Faulk, Jeff Frey, Mike Fergus, Roger Collis, and Gary Ballew.

IX. WRAP-UP

The next meeting will be held on September 18, 1996, from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. in the EESB Snoqualmie Room.

Future Agenda Items

- How Technology Fits in the Hanford 10-Year Plan
- Mixed Waste Subgroup Proposal
- In Situ Bioremediation Proposal
- Plumes Focus Area Plans and Priorities for FY97/FY98
- Sitewide Systems Engineering
- Quality of Proposals Sent to Focus Areas
- Update on What Was Funded by the Environmental Management Science Program (EMSP)
- Hanford Science Needs

List of Handouts

- Meeting Agenda
- STCG Management Council Meeting Minutes for July 1996
- STCG Complex-Wide Workshop (Nancy Uziemblo's presentation)
- Tanks Focus Area Support to the Hanford Site (Tom Brouns' presentation)
- TFA FY 1997 PEG versus STCG Request (Tom Brouns' handout)
- STCG Communications Plan
- Proposal for Large-Scale D&D Demonstration Project on U-Plant Fuel Reprocessing (Canyon) Facility Characterization

- Proposal for Large-Scale D&D Demonstration Project on Hanford Hot Cell and Glovebox Technology Demonstration
- Advance Program for Spectrum '96
- Summary Evaluations from July 1996 Meeting

Action Items

- Convene an ad-hoc committee to address Hanford 10-Year Plan issues.
- Convene an ad-hoc committee to develop an STCG communication strategy and prepare a budget estimate for implementing the strategy.
- Ask the Focus Areas for feedback on the quality of Hanford's technology needs lists and proposals.